

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 07 2009

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. Claims have not been amended in this response.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Eytchison et al. (US 7,206,853, hereinafter Eytchison).

Claim 1 recites in part, "obtaining, by the television apparatus, responsive to said user request, content information from the selected peripheral device regardless of whether the selected peripheral device is a currently selected input source for the television apparatus."

In contrast to claim 1, Eytchison at column 4, lines 65-67 teaches a device-centric architecture, wherein "[e]ach device is individually selected to access device controls and to locate, access, or engage content using that device." (emphasis added). According to Eytchison column 4, line 67 "this is what is meant by device-centric architecture." In other words, Eytchison appears to individually select a peripheral device to access device controls or content information **while using the selected peripheral device**.

Eytchison, however, does not mention or even suggest obtaining content information from peripheral device "regardless of whether the selected peripheral device is a currently selected input source for the television apparatus" (emphasis added) as recited in claim 1. In complete contrast to applicant's claimed invention, Eytchison teaches that each device is individually selected to access device controls and to locate, access, or engage content. Therefore, applicants claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Eytchison.

Independent claims 9 and 15, while different from claim 1, have several features similar to those of claim 1 discussed above, and therefore claims 9 and 15 are patently distinguished over the art of record for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2-8, 10-14, and 16-18 depend from claims 1, 9 and 15, respectively, and incorporate by reference all of the features of their respective parent claim. Therefore, claims 2-8, 10-14, and 16-18 patentably distinguish over the art of record for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 07 2009

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Eytchison in view of Sezan (US 2005/0060641).

Claims 19 and 20 depend from allowable claim 15. Thus Claims 19 and 20 incorporate by reference the features of claim 15 and patentably distinguish over Eytchison for at least the same reasons as those given earlier for the allowability of that claim. Even assuming arguendo that Sezan discloses the features as asserted in the office action, applicants submit that the additional features fail to overcome the defect if Eytchison as applied to claim 15.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants solicit allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

No fee is believed due with regard to this response. Please charge any fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Chad Andrew LeFevre, et al.



By: Paul P. Kiel, Attorney
Reg. No. 40,677
Phone (609) 734-6815

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
May 7, 2009